Remarks

1. The examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Thackara (USPN2766473). According to the examiner, "Thackara teaches ... The bearing portion and the outer portion comprise a mating connection to ensure tight trapping of the core. There are two resilient integral washers (17, 26) adjacent to the inner and outer faces to ensure a tight fit." I respectfully disagree with this conclusion.

In the Thackara's patent, the cap 16 represents the bearing portion, while the cap 25 represents the outer portion. According to the patent, the cap 16 and the cap 25 are independently mounted on the axle 13 and are not directly connected. The flanges 19 and 28 engage the edges of the sleeve to prevent its axial movement, but this does not ensure tight trapping.

Thackara's patent does not need tight trapping because it is utilizing another method of preventing leakage inside the roller cage: two washers (17, 26) that are located inside the sleeve core. According to this patent, the annular rings 17 and 26 "having an outside diameter about equal or slightly larger than the inside diameter of the sleeve 14 " so that with the help of slots 18 and 27 the rings "firmly but releasably engage the sleeve 14".

In my Claim 1 the bearing portion and the outer portion are squeezing the sleeve from two sides due to mating connection means, while in Thackara's patent the caps have no mating connection means. The two resilient washers in Claim 2 are located between the sleeve edges and the annular faces (to further facilitate the squeeze), while in Thackara's patent they reside inside the sleeve.

2. The examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 6 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Newman (USPN 3745624). I respectfully disagree with this conclusion.

Indeed, in the Newman's patent "the roller frame has a pair of independent frame units rotatable on a spindle of the paint roller". According to the patent, "elimination of the need for supporting connection between the two units allows the shiftable unit to be completely removed from the spindle".

In my Claim 1, on opposite, the bearing portion and the outer portion are firmly connected via the mating connection means. My Claim 4 proposes extensibility of the roller frame discussed in Claim 1. Therefore, in Claim 4 the two portions of the roller frame are also firmly connected via the mating connection means.

3. The examiner rejected Claims 8 because "the roller can be used without the hook and the hook can be used on any other tool as a means for hanging." The amended Claim 8 defines the hook as "a paint roller frame hook" making it relevant to the roller frame only. The amended claim also has some simplifications and changes in wording for better readability.

Note: Making Claim 8 dependable on Claim 1 would make it too narrow since the new hook location is not relevant to the roller cage design (the subject of Claim 1).

The novelty of Claim 8 is represented by an unconventional location of the roller frame hook. The hook is a traditional paint roller frame element, but traditionally the roller frame hook is an integral part of the roller frame handle or is adjacent to it. Claim 8 proposes a new location of the roller frame hook "to let more paint be pored in the paint bucket without the paint roller sleeve soaking the paint" while the roller frame is mounted "on a grid (a paint rack) fastened in a paint bucket." Hopefully, the amended claim better articulates this idea.

Sincerely,

L. Korenevsky

Lev Korenevsky
01/30/2004